

REMARKS

The foregoing amendments and these remarks are responsive to the Office Action mailed November 26, 2004 in connection with the above-identified application.

Allowable Subject Matter

The Applicant is pleased to note that the Examiner has indicated claims 8 and 9 were objected to as being dependent on a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Accordingly, the Applicant has amended base claim 1 to incorporate the allowable subjected matter of claim 8. The Applicant has also added new claim 12, which incorporates the allowable subject matter of claim 9 with the original base claim 1. Claims 8, 9 and 11 have been canceled.

The Applicant submits that the foregoing amendments overcome the Examiner's objection and that instantly amended claim 1 and new claim 12 are in condition for allowance. The Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the objections. The Applicant submits that claims 2-7 and 10 are now allowable because they depend from an allowable base claim (the instantly amended claim 1).

New Claims

Applicant's review of the Action indicates that the Applicant is further entitled to additional claims set forth in claims 12-19 which are directed to the embodiment inclusive of the allowable

subject matter of claim 9 in combination with the elements of the original base claim 1. No new matter is added. The Applicant submits that new claim 12 is allowable as indicated by the Examiner in the Action, and new claims 13-19 are allowable because they depend from an allowable base claim. Allowance of new claims 12-19 is therefore respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections 35 U.S.C. § 103

In the Action, claims 1, 3, 5-7, 10, and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kelley, U.S. Patent No. 4,754,379, in view of Kreutzer, U.S. Patent No. 4,402,542. Claim 2 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kelly in view of Kreutzer in further view of Uccellini, U.S. Patent No. 4,226,349. Claim 4 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kelly in view of Kreutzer.

As stated above, claim 1 has been amended to include the allowable subject matter of dependent claim 8. Claims 8, 9 and 11 have been canceled. The Applicant submits that instantly amended claim 1 is allowable, and claims 2-7 and 10 are allowable because they depend from an allowable base claim. Therefore, the Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 of claims 1-7 and 10 be withdrawn. Allowance of claims 1-7 and 10 is respectfully requested.

Conclusion


The Applicant respectfully submits that the application now stands in condition for allowance. The Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned in order to discuss any further

objections, allowing Applicant to expedite a response.

Respectfully submitted,

MCHALE & SLAVIN, P.A.

2/25/05
Date



Leah C. Saar
Reg. No. 54,417

McHale & Slavin, P.A.
2855 PGA Blvd.
Palm Beach Gardens, FL 33410
(561) 625-6575 - VOICE
(561)625-6572 -FAX